

applicant's claimed invention.

In fact, in Werkmeister the grip means only move from an operating position in which they are centered with the bar and the bar pusher, to an inactive position in which they are offset and leave a free passage for the bar pusher.

6

On the contrary, in the applicant's claim 1 the grip elements are movable along the axis of the bar to carry out a pre-advancement movement before the pusher means begin their action.

The combination of Werkmeister with Johnson does not add anything that could be interpreted as an element which destroys the inventiveness of the applicant's claim 1. Indeed, Johnson discloses a bar pusher which is a clearly conventional and essential element, strictly necessary in bar loaders.

The inventiveness of the applicant's claim 1 lies in the fact that the grip elements are able to move along the axis of the bar and this facilitates the loading of narrow bars that could otherwise be damaged if only the pusher bar acted upon them.

Instead, the movement of the grip means with the bar in a gripped position allows to carry out an initial advancement movement of the bar which is then pushed by the pusher bar, thus eliminating the danger of deforming the bar.

In view of this it is believed that the combination of the above-cited prior art documents does not nullify the inventiveness of the applicant's claim 1 and allowance of such claim is respectfully requested.

The applicant herewith proposes amended claims 1 and 6, drafted in order to overcome the rejections raised by the Examiner under 35 USC 112.

The wording "to move parallel to itself" means that the element carries out only a translatory motion, i.e. does not rotate. The only rotation is about an infinite point, i.e. its movement is only a translation. In any case the applicant has amended such wording and the amended claim 1 now recites that the pusher element translates.

Dependent claims 2-7 add further limitations to independent claim 1 wherefrom they each either directly or indirectly depend. Since independent claim 1 is already believed to be in an allowable condition and since dependent claims 2-7 add even further limitations thereto, such dependent claims are also believed to be in an allowable condition and allowance thereof is respectfully solicited.

It will be noted that a sincere effort has been made to positively respond to all of the points raised by the Examiner.

While it is believed that the amended claims properly define the present invention and distinguish the same over

the art of record, applicant would be open to any suggestion the Examiner may have concerning different claim phraseology which, in the Examiner's opinion, more accurately defines the present invention.

Respectfully submitted



GUIDO MODIANO (Reg. No. 19,928)

Agent for the applicant

Via Meravigli 16

20123 MILAN-ITALY

Tel. +39-02-8692442.

Milan: July 15, 1998

Encls.: - Petition for extension of time, in duplicate;  
- Letter to the Office Draftsman, in duplicate;  
- 3 Sketches in red ink;  
- 3 Informal drawing sheets.